

# THE CHRONICLE.

D. F. WRIGHT, M. D., Editor.

Clarksville, Tenn., Feb. 27, 1880.

TERMS: \$2.00 IN ADVANCE.

THE CHRONICLE'S ISSUE WITH THE HON. G. A. HENRY.

Anything which Major Henry may see fit to publish in relation to politics will always command respectful attention in Clarksville, and will certainly receive it in the Chronicle. Accordingly, having found ourselves the subject of severe strictures at the hands of that gentleman in consequence of an article of ours relating to Mr. Tilden's candidacy, we have considered it our duty to reiterate that article with care, that we might correct and modify anything which, in the light of that gentleman's comments, might seem to need revision. Having so reprinted it, we are constrained to say we see nothing to retract.

We will, however, go over some of the points on which the Major makes issue with us, but must premise that from the first he misapprehends our position. He assumes that we are a Bayard man in the same sense as he is a Tilden man. This is a gross error. We have indeed held that Mr. Bayard is the best out of many candidates whom we could honestly support, including not only Bayard, Hancock, and Hendricks, but even Mr. Tilden himself, but the article in question was not written in his interest, except defensively; his name would never have come into the article except as being the last of a series of possible Democratic candidates who have been made the objects of virulent attacks in the Tilden papers. If he will give himself the trouble, therefore, to re-peruse our article, he will find that he has made a point quite gratuitously when he says:

It is rather hard on Mr. Tilden that he should be held responsible for the imputed indiscretion of his friends. Doubtless Mr. Bayard—the cheater Bayard—would feel that great injustice had been done him if he were to be held responsible for the indiscretions of the Chronicle, and would be forced to cry out, "Save me from the indiscretions of my friends!"

The Chronicle has never come forward as a Bayard paper, and Mr. Bayard is not probably aware of its existence. Can the same be said of Mr. Tilden and the New York Sun, which has for some time been the director of the Tilden tactics, and which was made the medium of the attack on Mr. Bayard which was the occasion of our article? The Sun has for a long time had more to say against possible Democratic candidates than against anyone in the Republican party, and in the interest of Mr. Tilden. The Sun is published in the city of Mr. Tilden's residence, the city in which his political influence is mainly exercised, and Mr. Tilden is known to have been a recent purchaser of a very large amount of stock in that paper, and if he does not directly inspire its strategy, it will be very difficult to persuade people that he disapproves of its methods.

This is, however, practically of little moment. If the Tilden interest is to be promoted on this method, it is little matter whether Mr. Tilden personally directs it, if perpetual disparagement of every possible Democratic candidate is to be the mode in which Mr. Tilden's claims are to be advanced, that method must be denounced by true Democratic journals, whoever is responsible for it, and it was for the purpose of so denouncing it that the article criticized by Major Henry was written. That this has been the method of the Tildenian journals no one who habitually reads papers such as the New York Sun and the Louisville Courier-Journal can fail to see. The objective point of both these journals is to establish the theory that there is only one man in the Democratic party who can hold the banner with credit, and believing that theory to be the most injurious to the party, believing that there are better men better able to hold that banner, we have deemed it our duty to denounce it as undemocratic, and expect to adhere to that position. If the article bears the appearance of an attack on Mr. Tilden, those are responsible who in his interest have assailed all other Democratic statesmen.

Thus much we have said to clear our position. If we have attacked Mr. Tilden, it is only so far as he is the assailant of all other possible Democratic candidates. And here our paper might terminate, but we will say a little in relation to the following passage in Major Henry's letter:

So bitter has the Chronicle's growth of late been, that it endorses the stale slander against Tilden that, through his nephew (Pelton), he offered to bribe a Presidential elector. This would have been expected of a rabid Radical sheet, but it is scandalous to see it soiling the columns of the old and heretofore conservative Chronicle, the leading Democratic newspaper, north of Nashville, in Tennessee.

Now, Major Henry in the latter part of his letter contends that the main issue to be made in the approaching campaign is the fraud of 1876. As certainly as we do so, this Pelton affair will be brought up in rejoinder, and where we assume the offensive we shall be promptly put on the defensive; and what will be our defense? It is well to talk of rabid Radical sheets, but as practical politicians we are bound to consider what those sheets are going to say and how we are going to meet them. We do not endorse the charge against Mr. Tilden ourselves, but that is not the point; the question is how we are going to meet it when advanced, as it will be, by our antagonists, who will advance it, and that without scruple. We say it is not a question of Mr. Tilden, constantly attacking in his behalf and in his interest confidential relations with him; it

is moreover known that he has no money of his own to make such offers with. In elections, proof such as would stand in a court of justice is not needed; probable grounds of suspicion are sufficient to convert an offensive into a defensive position, and we can't maintain the offensive in the proposed program. Unless we can, the program had better be at once abandoned, and with it the candidate who makes that program the selected position for his field of battle.

If after all, however, Mr. Tilden should be nominated by the party, we will do our best in his support. Our present purpose is to show that he is not the only available candidate, to repel the injurious stigma on the Democratic party that it has only one man capable of asserting its principles before the nation. In furtherance of this purpose we hope next week to discuss the availability of some of the other candidates besides Mr. Tilden.

Our position is the support of the nominee.

## OUR VISIT TO LOUISVILLE.

Col. House's eloquent speech monopolized our columns last week to such an extent as to exclude much that we had prepared to publish in that issue. We give a portion of it in the present paper, and commend with some impressions derived from a visit to Louisville; for it is a condition of reading the Chronicle that when the editor travels, his readers have to travel with him.

Louisville is a new city to us. We knew it in the old days, long before we were when the railroad came to the city, and received its guests as an emperor might be supposed to give audience to the corps diplomatique, when the Guthries, the Ormsbys and the Bullis, as a general oligarchy, ruled its social arrangements, and how long that was ago makes us feel too old to compute with precision. Since the time we have been in the city, we have seen two or three flying visits in transit, and seen but little of it. As we said, it is a new city now; the Galt House has moved two squares higher up, and the old families are gone, and the city is ruled now by railway kings; Henry Watterson sits in the seat of Prentiss the Great, and instead of internecine war between the Journal and the Courier, they are now on a level, and the railway kings seem to be a beneficent one on the whole. In our time the Galt House, though two squares lower down than it is now, was separated by a wide interval from the business part of the city, but now business houses of the first magnitude extend far above it. The fine old mansions on Walnut and Chestnut stand where they did, but are supplemented by innumerable residences on Broad street, and the further part of Fourth extending even in beauty. But the streets—alas! alas! they are Louisville's weak point. The streets themselves are in a condition astounding to the visitor. He who wishes to cross Main street will do well to thrust his pantaloons into his boots and then plunge at random. There is no choice between crossings and the street in general; indeed, it only becomes manifest that there were any crossings after a deep geological exploration through several superposed strata. We have been accustomed to admire the breadth of the Louisville streets, but perhaps this is not an unimaged advantage, for it adds so much to the expense of keeping them up that sometimes, as in the present instance, they are as high up as the clouds.

One of our leading purposes in visiting the city was to hear an opera or two. The Emma Abbott Opera Company were performing there with some opera on their repertoire which we had never heard. The two operas we attended were the Romeo and Juliet of Gounod and Bizet's Carmen, typical of the French school of French opera, and, believing that these were to be the most injurious to the party, believing that there are better men better able to hold that banner, we have deemed it our duty to denounce it as undemocratic, and expect to adhere to that position. If the article bears the appearance of an attack on Mr. Tilden, those are responsible who in his interest have assailed all other Democratic statesmen.

Thus much we have said to clear our position. If we have attacked Mr. Tilden, it is only so far as he is the assailant of all other possible Democratic candidates. And here our paper might terminate, but we will say a little in relation to the following passage in Major Henry's letter:

So bitter has the Chronicle's growth of late been, that it endorses the stale slander against Tilden that, through his nephew (Pelton), he offered to bribe a Presidential elector. This would have been expected of a rabid Radical sheet, but it is scandalous to see it soiling the columns of the old and heretofore conservative Chronicle, the leading Democratic newspaper, north of Nashville, in Tennessee.

Now, Major Henry in the latter part of his letter contends that the main issue to be made in the approaching campaign is the fraud of 1876. As certainly as we do so, this Pelton affair will be brought up in rejoinder, and where we assume the offensive we shall be promptly put on the defensive; and what will be our defense? It is well to talk of rabid Radical sheets, but as practical politicians we are bound to consider what those sheets are going to say and how we are going to meet them. We do not endorse the charge against Mr. Tilden ourselves, but that is not the point; the question is how we are going to meet it when advanced, as it will be, by our antagonists, who will advance it, and that without scruple. We say it is not a question of Mr. Tilden, constantly attacking in his behalf and in his interest confidential relations with him; it

is moreover known that he has no money of his own to make such offers with. In elections, proof such as would stand in a court of justice is not needed; probable grounds of suspicion are sufficient to convert an offensive into a defensive position, and we can't maintain the offensive in the proposed program. Unless we can, the program had better be at once abandoned, and with it the candidate who makes that program the selected position for his field of battle.

If after all, however, Mr. Tilden should be nominated by the party, we will do our best in his support. Our present purpose is to show that he is not the only available candidate, to repel the injurious stigma on the Democratic party that it has only one man capable of asserting its principles before the nation. In furtherance of this purpose we hope next week to discuss the availability of some of the other candidates besides Mr. Tilden.

Our position is the support of the nominee.

## THE KELLOGG BUSINESS.

The reports of the Senate Committee on Elections and Privileges have been presented to the Senate; to wit: a majority report by Mr. Hill and a minority report by Mr. Hoar. An angry debate ensued on the motion to print, which was joined in by Messrs. Hill, Hoar, Carpenter and Mr. Kellogg himself. This debate was justly condemned by the committee before the House. Mr. Kellogg attributed the blame of this premature debate to Mr. Hill, on account of his insisting upon reading his report. But this was unjust, since Mr. Hill was willing to present his majority report without reading, provided Mr. Hoar would do the same with the minority report, but this Mr. Hoar declined to do, and both reports were read.

Mr. Hoar's report was read, and Mr. Kellogg's report was read, and the Senate adjourned.

## DOINGS IN CONGRESS.

Some important business has been transacted in Congress this week, and as that is rather a novelty in the present session, it is noted.

The subject of appropriation for the payment of Deputy Marshals to be employed in elections has been the subject of heated and protracted altercation, and there seemed to be reason to apprehend that the fruitless bickering of the extra session might be revived, with no more satisfactory issue than before.

An amendment, however, of Mr. Garfield's bill, which provided for the termination of the extra session, was adopted, and the bill was passed.

## THE KELLOGG BUSINESS.

The reports of the Senate Committee on Elections and Privileges have been presented to the Senate; to wit: a majority report by Mr. Hill and a minority report by Mr. Hoar. An angry debate ensued on the motion to print, which was joined in by Messrs. Hill, Hoar, Carpenter and Mr. Kellogg himself. This debate was justly condemned by the committee before the House. Mr. Kellogg attributed the blame of this premature debate to Mr. Hill, on account of his insisting upon reading his report. But this was unjust, since Mr. Hill was willing to present his majority report without reading, provided Mr. Hoar would do the same with the minority report, but this Mr. Hoar declined to do, and both reports were read.

Mr. Hoar's report was read, and Mr. Kellogg's report was read, and the Senate adjourned.

## A STRAY LEAF.

EDITOR CHRONICLE: As the time approaches when the country will be stirred by the active scenes of a Presidential contest, it is not strange that those who take an interest in political movements should watch, with interest, the various developments in the approaching conflict.

Of course we of Montgomery county are obliged to derive our information, to a great extent, from our local county papers, to-wit, the CHRONICLE and Semi-Weekly Leaf. I was struck with the article in the CHRONICLE of the 18th inst., which took the position that Mr. Tilden, though a great man, was not the man to be nominated by the Democratic party, and that the attacks made by those papers be made to be his organs, on every other prospective Democratic candidate, could not induce the intelligent people of Montgomery county to believe that the great party opposed to centralization, Grantism, and corruption was so deathly Presidential timber that it must devour only the sage of Gramercy Park or be lost. This idea, when uttered, becomes a slander, and Mr. Tilden and his friends do no good for his candidacy when they undertake to retire such men as Bayard, Thurman, and Hancock from the contest, by seeking to asperse their heretofore unsullied public and private characters.

Now, Mr. Editor, I do not wish to understand that I am opposed to Mr. Tilden on the ground that he is a unit person to be President of the United States. I have a great admiration for his ability and statesmanship, and should be the nominee of the Democratic party, I shall vote for him, and influence or induce as many votes as possible to be cast for him. But it is the impression of myself and a great many others with whom I have conversed that New York is the pivotal State in the next contest, and that unless we can secure a candidate who can carry New York, with her thirty-five electoral votes, we are beaten. At the last State election it was well known that Mr. Robinson, was Tilden's candidate, that it was a fight from the nomination till the election, that a whole fight was Tilden and anti-Tilden. Gov. Robinson, who confessedly was one of the best governors New York ever had, was nominated in the interest of Mr. Tilden, and was run in his interests, and was beaten because of the strong opposition to Mr. Tilden. It was so considered by all parties, and the result was worked out on that idea.

It may be very good sentiment to say that a great party will not yield to the demands of a few thousand bolters in New York, but this is a practical question; if these few thousand bolters, who are such only by reference to one man, will support warmly other men equally as capable, equally as honest, and who with equally as much credit to the party which he represented, would ask the nomination of the party, whom they are so violently opposed? Why not nominate some man not mixed up in the local quarrels in New York and thus insure the success of the party by saving the pivotal State? It is an idea that prevails with some that the party owes it to Mr. Tilden to renounce him. The Democratic party of the United States is no man's debtor.

It was not surprising after the Chronicle took a stand opposing the nomination of Mr. Tilden, that the Tobacco Leaf should vehemently urge that he was the one man to be nominated. That fact, I say, had no significance, and created no surprise. But when the Leaf went further, and to fortify its position as a Democratic paper, published long lists of parties, and their choice for President, I began to think over the matter, and to wonder if I was in such a hopeless minority in this country. Mr. Editor, I am in sympathy with the Leaf in one point; I do not like to be in a hopeless minority. It is more pleasant and profitable to be in a majority.

When I read the list of names just spoken of, published in the Leaf, I began to question its accuracy, and without any special investigation whatever, I am prepared to bid those who, like myself, do not enjoy being members of a hopeless minority, to cheer up.

The Leaf and myself accord in the sentiment "The Union is generally reflected upon as a sentiment," but I deny that the result of his alleged interviews with the 32 persons, of whom he gives 262 as being for Tilden, is correct, authentic, or authorized.

Now let us see—we quote from the Leaf:

"P. H. Keese & Co., stemmers; 30 votes, all for Tilden." Did the Leaf see each one of these 30 votes which it proposes to cast for Tilden?

Now let us see—we quote from the Leaf:

"P. H. Keese & Co., stemmers; 30 votes, all for Tilden." Did the Leaf see each one of these 30 votes which it proposes to cast for Tilden?

Now let us see—we quote from the Leaf:

"P. H. Keese & Co., stemmers; 30 votes, all for Tilden." Did the Leaf see each one of these 30 votes which it proposes to cast for Tilden?

Now let us see—we quote from the Leaf:

"P. H. Keese & Co., stemmers; 30 votes, all for Tilden." Did the Leaf see each one of these 30 votes which it proposes to cast for Tilden?

Now let us see—we quote from the Leaf:

"P. H. Keese & Co., stemmers; 30 votes, all for Tilden." Did the Leaf see each one of these 30 votes which it proposes to cast for Tilden?

Now let us see—we quote from the Leaf:

"P. H. Keese & Co., stemmers; 30 votes, all for Tilden." Did the Leaf see each one of these 30 votes which it proposes to cast for Tilden?

Now let us see—we quote from the Leaf:

"P. H. Keese & Co., stemmers; 30 votes, all for Tilden." Did the Leaf see each one of these 30 votes which it proposes to cast for Tilden?

Now let us see—we quote from the Leaf:

## THE CHRONICLE'S ISSUE WITH THE HON. G. A. HENRY.

Clarksville, Tenn., Feb. 27, 1880.

TERMS: \$2.00 IN ADVANCE.

THE CHRONICLE'S ISSUE WITH THE HON. G. A. HENRY.

Anything which Major Henry may see fit to publish in relation to politics will always command respectful attention in Clarksville, and will certainly receive it in the Chronicle. Accordingly, having found ourselves the subject of severe strictures at the hands of that gentleman in consequence of an article of ours relating to Mr. Tilden's candidacy, we have considered it our duty to reiterate that article with care, that we might correct and modify anything which, in the light of that gentleman's comments, might seem to need revision. Having so reprinted it, we are constrained to say we see nothing to retract.

We will, however, go over some of the points on which the Major makes issue with us, but must premise that from the first he misapprehends our position. He assumes that we are a Bayard man in the same sense as he is a Tilden man. This is a gross error. We have indeed held that Mr. Bayard is the best out of many candidates whom we could honestly support, including not only Bayard, Hancock, and Hendricks, but even Mr. Tilden himself, but the article in question was not written in his interest, except defensively; his name would never have come into the article except as being the last of a series of possible Democratic candidates who have been made the objects of virulent attacks in the Tilden papers. If he will give himself the trouble, therefore, to re-peruse our article, he will find that he has made a point quite gratuitously when he says:

It is rather hard on Mr. Tilden that he should be held responsible for the imputed indiscretion of his friends. Doubtless Mr. Bayard—the cheater Bayard—would feel that great injustice had been done him if he were to be held responsible for the indiscretions of the Chronicle, and would be forced to cry out, "Save me from the indiscretions of my friends!"

The Chronicle has never come forward as a Bayard paper, and Mr. Bayard is not probably aware of its existence. Can the same be said of Mr. Tilden and the New York Sun, which has for some time been the director of the Tilden tactics, and which was made the medium of the attack on Mr. Bayard which was the occasion of our article? The Sun has for a long time had more to say against possible Democratic candidates than against anyone in the Republican party, and in the interest of Mr. Tilden. The Sun is published in the city of Mr. Tilden's residence, the city in which his political influence is mainly exercised, and Mr. Tilden is known to have been a recent purchaser of a very large amount of stock in that paper, and if he does not directly inspire its strategy, it will be very difficult to persuade people that he disapproves of its methods.

This is, however, practically of little moment. If the Tilden interest is to be promoted on this method, it is little matter whether Mr. Tilden personally directs it, if perpetual disparagement of every possible Democratic candidate is to be the mode in which Mr. Tilden's claims are to be advanced, that method must be denounced by true Democratic journals, whoever is responsible for it, and it was for the purpose of so denouncing it that the article criticized by Major Henry was written. That this has been the method of the Tildenian journals no one who habitually reads papers such as the New York Sun and the Louisville Courier-Journal can fail to see. The objective point of both these journals is to establish the theory that there is only one man in the Democratic party who can hold the banner with credit, and believing that theory to be the most injurious to the party, believing that there are better men better able to hold that banner, we have deemed it our duty to denounce it as undemocratic, and expect to adhere to that position. If the article bears the appearance of an attack on Mr. Tilden, those are responsible who in his interest have assailed all other Democratic statesmen.

Thus much we have said to clear our position. If we have attacked Mr. Tilden, it is only so far as he is the assailant of all other possible Democratic candidates. And here our paper might terminate, but we will say a little in relation to the following passage in Major Henry's letter:

So bitter has the Chronicle's growth of late been, that it endorses the stale slander against Tilden that, through his nephew (Pelton), he offered to bribe a Presidential elector. This would have been expected of a rabid Radical sheet, but it is scandalous to see it soiling the columns of the old and heretofore conservative Chronicle, the leading Democratic newspaper, north of Nashville, in Tennessee.

Now, Major Henry in the latter part of his letter contends that the main issue to be made in the approaching campaign is the fraud of 1876. As certainly as we do so, this Pelton affair will be brought up in rejoinder, and where we assume the offensive we shall be promptly put on the defensive; and what will be our defense? It is well to talk of rabid Radical sheets, but as practical politicians we are bound to consider what those sheets are going to say and how we are going to meet them. We do not endorse the charge against Mr. Tilden ourselves, but that is not the point; the question is how we are going to meet it when advanced, as it will be, by our antagonists, who will advance it, and that without scruple. We say it is not a question of Mr. Tilden, constantly attacking in his behalf and in his interest confidential relations with him; it

is moreover known that he has no money of his own to make such offers with. In elections, proof such as would stand in a court of justice is not needed; probable grounds of suspicion are sufficient to convert an offensive into a defensive position, and we can't maintain the offensive in the proposed program. Unless we can, the program had better be at once abandoned, and with it the candidate who makes that program the selected position for his field of battle.

If after all, however, Mr. Tilden should be nominated by the party, we will do our best in his support. Our present purpose is to show that he is not the only available candidate, to repel the injurious stigma on the Democratic party that it has only one man capable of asserting its principles before the nation. In furtherance of this purpose we hope next week to discuss the availability of some of the other candidates besides Mr. Tilden.

Our position is the support of the nominee.

## THE KELLOGG BUSINESS.

The reports of the Senate Committee on Elections and Privileges have been presented to the Senate; to wit: a majority report by Mr. Hill and a minority report by Mr. Hoar. An angry debate ensued on the motion to print, which was joined in by Messrs. Hill, Hoar, Carpenter and Mr. Kellogg himself. This debate was justly condemned by the committee before the House. Mr. Kellogg attributed the blame of this premature debate to Mr. Hill, on account of his insisting upon reading his report. But this was unjust, since Mr. Hill was willing to present his majority report without reading, provided Mr. Hoar would do the same with the minority report, but this Mr. Hoar declined to do, and both reports were read.

Mr. Hoar's report was read, and Mr. Kellogg's report was read, and the Senate adjourned.

## DOINGS IN CONGRESS.

Some important business has been transacted in Congress this week, and as that is rather a novelty in the present session, it is noted.

The subject of appropriation for the payment of Deputy Marshals to be employed in elections has been the subject of heated and protracted altercation, and there seemed to be reason to apprehend that the fruitless bickering of the extra session might be revived, with no more satisfactory issue than before.

An amendment, however, of Mr. Garfield's bill, which provided for the termination of the extra session, was adopted, and the bill was passed.

## THE KELLOGG BUSINESS.

The reports of the Senate Committee on Elections and Privileges have been presented to the Senate; to wit: a majority report by Mr. Hill and a minority report by Mr. Hoar. An angry debate ensued on the motion to print, which was joined in by Messrs. Hill, Hoar, Carpenter and Mr. Kellogg himself. This debate was justly condemned by the committee before the House. Mr. Kellogg attributed the blame of this premature debate to Mr. Hill, on account of his insisting upon reading his report. But this was unjust, since Mr. Hill was willing to present his majority report without reading, provided Mr. Hoar would do the same with the minority report, but this Mr. Hoar declined to do, and both reports were read.

Mr. Hoar's report was read, and Mr. Kellogg's report was read, and the Senate adjourned.

## A STRAY LEAF.

EDITOR CHRONICLE: As the time approaches when the country will be stirred by the active scenes of a Presidential contest, it is not strange that those who take an interest in political movements should watch, with interest, the various developments in the approaching conflict.

Of course we of Montgomery county are obliged to derive our information, to a great extent, from our local county papers, to-wit, the CHRONICLE and Semi-Weekly Leaf. I was struck with the article in the CHRONICLE of the 18th inst., which took the position that Mr. Tilden, though a great man, was not the man to be nominated by the Democratic party, and that the attacks made by those papers be made to be his organs, on every other prospective Democratic candidate, could not induce the intelligent people of Montgomery county to believe that the great party opposed to centralization, Grantism, and corruption was so deathly Presidential timber that it must devour only the sage of Gramercy Park or be lost. This idea, when uttered, becomes a slander, and Mr. Tilden and his friends do no good for his candidacy when they undertake to retire such men as Bayard, Thurman, and Hancock from the contest, by seeking to asperse their heretofore unsullied public and private characters.

Now, Mr. Editor, I do not wish to understand that I am opposed to Mr. Tilden on the ground that he is a unit person to be President of the United States. I have a great admiration for his ability and statesmanship, and should be the nominee of the Democratic party, I shall vote for him, and influence or induce as many votes as possible to be cast for him. But it is the impression of myself and a great many others with whom I have conversed that New York is the pivotal State in the next contest, and that unless we can secure a candidate who can carry New York, with her thirty-five electoral votes, we are beaten. At the last State election it was well known that Mr. Robinson, was Tilden's candidate, that it was a fight from the nomination till the election, that a whole fight was Tilden and anti-Tilden. Gov. Robinson, who confessedly was one of the best governors New York ever had, was nominated in the interest of Mr. Tilden, and was run in his interests, and was beaten because of the strong opposition to Mr. Tilden. It was so considered by all parties, and the result was worked out on that idea.

It may be very good sentiment to say that a great party will not yield to the demands of a few thousand bolters in New York, but this is a practical question; if these few thousand bolters, who are such only by reference to one man, will support warmly other men equally as capable, equally as honest, and who with equally as much credit to the party which he represented, would ask the nomination of the party, whom they are so violently opposed? Why not nominate some man not mixed up in the local quarrels in New York and thus insure the success of the party by saving the pivotal State? It is an idea that prevails with some that the party owes it to Mr. Tilden to renounce him. The Democratic party of the United States is no man's debtor.

It was not surprising after the Chronicle took a stand opposing the nomination of Mr. Tilden, that the Tobacco Leaf should vehemently urge that he was the one man to be nominated. That fact, I say, had no significance, and created no surprise. But when the Leaf went further, and to fortify its position as a Democratic paper, published long lists of parties, and their choice for President, I began to think over the matter, and to wonder if I was in such a hopeless minority in this country. Mr. Editor, I am in sympathy with the Leaf in one point; I do not like to be in a hopeless minority. It is more pleasant and profitable to be in a majority.

When I read the list of names just spoken of, published in the Leaf, I began to question its accuracy, and without any special investigation whatever, I am prepared to bid those who, like myself, do not enjoy being members of a hopeless minority, to cheer up.

The Leaf and myself accord in the sentiment "The Union is generally reflected upon as a sentiment," but I deny that the result of his alleged interviews with the 32 persons, of whom he gives 262 as being for Tilden, is correct, authentic, or authorized.

Now let us see—we quote from the Leaf:

"P. H. Keese & Co., stemmers; 30 votes, all for Tilden." Did the Leaf see each one of these 30 votes which it proposes to cast for Tilden?

Now let us see—we quote from the Leaf:

"P. H. Keese & Co., stemmers; 30 votes, all for Tilden." Did the Leaf see each one of these 30 votes which it proposes to cast for Tilden?

Now let us see—we quote from the Leaf:

"P. H. Keese & Co., stemmers; 30 votes, all for Tilden." Did the Leaf see each one of these 30 votes which it proposes to cast for Tilden?

Now let us see—we quote from the Leaf:

"P. H. Keese & Co., stemmers; 30 votes, all for Tilden." Did the Leaf see each one of these 30 votes which it proposes to cast for Tilden?

Now let us see—we quote from the Leaf:

"P. H. Keese & Co., stemmers; 30 votes, all for Tilden." Did the Leaf see each one of these 30 votes which it proposes to cast for Tilden?

Now let us see—we quote from the Leaf:

"P. H. Keese & Co., stemmers; 30 votes, all for Tilden." Did the Leaf see each one of these 30 votes which it proposes to cast for Tilden?

Now let us see—we quote from the Leaf:

"P. H. Keese & Co., stemmers; 30 votes, all for Tilden." Did the Leaf see each one of these 30 votes which it proposes to cast for Tilden?

Now let us see—we quote from the Leaf:

"P. H. Keese & Co., stemmers; 30 votes, all for Tilden." Did the Leaf see each one of these 30 votes which it proposes to cast for Tilden?

## THE CHRONICLE'S ISSUE WITH THE HON. G. A. HENRY.

Clarksville, Tenn., Feb. 27, 1880.

TERMS: \$2.00 IN ADVANCE.

THE CHRONICLE'S ISSUE WITH THE HON. G. A. HENRY.

Anything which Major Henry may see fit to publish in relation to politics will always command respectful attention in Clarksville, and will certainly receive it in the Chronicle. Accordingly, having found ourselves the subject of severe strictures at the hands of that gentleman in consequence of an article of ours relating to Mr. Tilden's candidacy, we have considered it our duty to reiterate that article with care, that we might correct and modify anything which, in the light of that gentleman's comments, might seem to need revision. Having so reprinted it, we are constrained to say we see nothing to retract.

We will, however, go over some of the points on which the Major makes issue with us, but must premise that from the first he misapprehends our position. He assumes that we are a Bayard man in the same sense as he is a Tilden man. This is a gross error. We have indeed held that Mr. Bayard is the best out of many candidates whom we could honestly support, including not only Bayard, Hancock, and Hendricks, but even Mr. Tilden himself, but the article in question was not written in his interest, except defensively; his name would never have come into the article except as being the last of a series of possible Democratic candidates who have been made the objects of virulent attacks in the Tilden papers. If he will give himself the trouble, therefore, to re-peruse our article, he will find that he has made a point quite gratuitously when he says:

It is rather hard on Mr. Tilden that he should be held responsible for the imputed indiscretion of his friends. Doubtless Mr. Bayard—the cheater Bayard—would feel that great injustice had been done him if he were to be held responsible for the indiscretions of the Chronicle, and would be forced to cry out, "Save me from the indiscretions of my friends!"

The Chronicle has never come forward as a Bayard paper, and Mr. Bayard is not probably aware of its existence. Can the same be said of Mr. Tilden and the New York Sun, which has for some time been the director of the Tilden tactics, and which was made the medium of the attack on Mr. Bayard which was the occasion of our article? The Sun has for a long time had more to say against possible Democratic candidates than against anyone in the Republican party, and in the interest of Mr. Tilden. The Sun is published in the city of Mr. Tilden's residence, the city in which his political influence is mainly exercised, and Mr. Tilden is known to have been a recent purchaser of a very large amount of stock in that paper, and if he does not directly inspire its strategy, it will be very difficult to persuade people that he disapproves of its methods.

This is, however, practically of little moment. If the Tilden interest is to be promoted on this method, it is little matter whether Mr. Tilden personally directs it, if perpetual disparagement of every possible Democratic candidate is to be the mode in which Mr. Tilden's claims are to be advanced, that method must be denounced by true Democratic journals, whoever is responsible for it, and it was for the purpose of so denouncing it that the article criticized by Major Henry was written. That this has been the method of the Tildenian journals no one who habitually reads papers such as the New York Sun and the Louisville Courier-Journal can fail to see. The objective point of both these journals is to establish the theory that there is only one man in the Democratic party who can hold the banner with credit, and believing that theory to be the most injurious to the party, believing that there are better men better able to hold that banner, we have deemed it our duty to denounce it as undemocratic, and expect to adhere to that position. If the article bears the appearance of an attack on Mr. Tilden, those are responsible who in his interest have assailed all other Democratic statesmen.